Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

96 326 JUN 20 1996

U.S.S.C. Case No.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

CORRECTED PETITION TERM AUGUST 26, 1996
OCTOBER TERM, 1996

In re: PRASEUTH PANTHONG,
Petitioner

v.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT, et al.
Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR REVIEW ON THE ORDER OF
THE DIRECTOR OF U.S. COURTS EMPLOYEES
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR
THE FIRST CIRCUIT, JUDGES: SELYA, BOUDIN, AND STAHL

PETITION FOR AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND CERTIORARI, AND/OR FOR AN ALTERNATIVE WRIT

PRASEUTH PANTHONG 348
Walker Street, Room #6 Lowell,
Massachusetts 01851

August 19, 1996

Petitioner Pro se Self-Counsel of Record.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

I. The petitioner petition for review for whether agency neglect and inefficiency to adjudication and agency indirectly acted under color of legal wrong of employees thereof and motion for leave to intervene for judgment by default for failure of director answer to a petition within 20 days were denied of the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit on below:

II. The petitioner's judgment of the complaint is dismissed of the deputy clerk, whether there was failed to adjudication within quarterly of the Director of U.S. Courts, to the court interlocutory order the defendants motion to dismiss complaint are allowed.

III. The petitioner was indirectly cause making judgment entry the complaint is dismissed to the court interlocutory order the defendants motion to dismiss complaint are allowed by Director of the deputy clerk.

IV. After heard the sound of some police told and the petitioner leave from the area of U.S. Magistrate Judge Chambers where petitioner conflict with some deputy clerk and would not gave petitioner's own brief case to the some police who inform but the petitioner was indirectly cause issued the statement of the claim (1) the petitioner disorderly conduct refuse, and (2) attempted to assault the police officer and (3) called and removed from the purpose of enjoying benefit service right privilege, and opposing, by the Director of U.S. Courts of the federal police officer and staff of U.S. Magistrate Judge or deputy clerk.

THE BASIS STATEMENT FOR THE COURT JURISDICTION

A petition for an extraordinary writ, in aid of U.S. Supreme Court's Appellate Jurisdiction, in concerning to the Ordered of the U.S. Court Appeals for the First Circuit Denied the petition for review on agency failed to acted and director indirectly acted under color of legal wrong of employees thereof, and motion for leave to intervene for judgment by default for failure of agency answer to a petition within 20 days, entered on April 11 1996.

JURISDICTION

The United States Supreme Court shall have original but not exclusive jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1251(b)(1); Go review the cases in the court of appeals pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1254(1); and all other case the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction pursuant to Article III of the United States Constitution, to provide the basis for review on the extraordinary writ of mandamus and certiorari the order denied of court of appeals shall have appropriate original jurisdiction as first instance of the court pursuant to 5 U.S. C. Sec. Sec. 702, 704, and 706, to review on agency failed to acted and agency indirectly acted under color of legal wrong of employees thereof in some cause. Because due process clause of Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment authorize the petitioner relief from further suffering by legal authority wrong.

A DIRECTED OF ALLOWANCE FOR A WRITS

(i). The-petitioner petition for review against agency neglected and inefficiency to adjudication on error judgment entry and against agency indirectly acted under color of legal wrong of federal police officer and deputy clerk thereof to which the petitioner shall be entitle to the court of appeals for review pursuant to Title 5 U.S.C. Sec. Sec 702 704 and 706. but the petition was denied of the court of appeals.

(ii). The petitioner file this petition for an extraordinary writs

of mandamus and certiorari, and/or for an alternative writ the Supreme Court shall issue for review in accordance within Rule 20.2.3(a) the procedure of the United States Surpreme Court for any person filing the petition for an extraordinary writ base on directed.

There shall be absence of mistakenly the petitioner petition to the Supreme Court for a writ of mandamus to the Court of Appeals base on 28 U.S.C. Sec. 342, the Supreme Court shall have power to issue a writ of mandamus in case warranted by the principles and usages of law, to any courts apointed under authority of the United States where the court is a party. In 28 U.S.C. Sec 376, the Supreme Court shall have power to issue all writs not specifically provide for by the statute. See Revisio Notes and Legislative Reports 1948 Acts. Base on Title 28 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 342, 376, (1940 ed) 36 Stat. 156-1162.

when the court of appeals did not accepted the petiton fo review to which the petitioner shall be entitle to the court of appeals for review under principles of laws "see paragraph (i) of this subparagraph the Supreme Court shall be also issue a writ of certiorari base on all writs Act in 28 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 1651 and 2241(a), tne Supreme Court establish by Act of Congress may have power to issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdiction and agreeable usages and principles of law, and/or an alternative writ may issue by whom which has jurisdiction. In ITT Comm Development Corp. v. Barton, 569 F.2d 1351-1352 (1978), all writs act empower federal couirt to employ procedures necessary to promoted resolution of issues in case properly before it and this power is limited to facilitation of court's effort to manage case to judgment. In Plum Creek Lumber Co. v. Hutton, 608 F.2d 1285 (1979), all writ act is not grant of plenary power to the federal courts but rather is designed to aid courts in exercise of their jurisdiction; it does not authorize a court to order a party to bear risks not otherwise demanded by law or to aid the government in conducting a more efficient investigation when other forms are available.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I. The United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit did not deciding the petition for review in which the case of petitioner

against Director of U.S. Courts neglect and inefficiency to adjudicate on error judgment entry and employees thereof acted under color of legal wrong; and denied petitioner's motion for leave to intervene for judgment by default for failure of agency answer to a petition within 20 days, shall be failure of U.S. Court of Appeals to establish appropriate original jurisdiction as first instance of the court and the rule of the procedure of the court of appeals under 5 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 702, 704, and 706; and Fed. Rule App. Pro. 15(a)(d); Port Wide Container Company, Inc. v. Interstate Maintenance Corp. 440 F.2d 1195 (3 the Cir. 1971), motion denied 420 F.2d 1364 (10th Cir. 1970), petition for rehearing and/or modification decision denied 21 F.2d 808, affirmed 635 F.2ds 603 (7th Cir. 1980).

The Court of Appeals entered in the ordered the petition for review as mandamus, shall be prohibit from entered in the ordered the title word "mandamus" establish in Plum Creek Lumber Co. v. Hutton, 608 F.2d 1285 (1979).

II. Whether the Director failed to adjudicate within quarterly on the error judgment entry of the complaint is dismissed of deputy clerk to be the judgment entry of the complaint is affirmed for comply the court interlocutory order the defendants' motion to dismiss complaint are Allowed, shall be declare void and rescind contract for unlawfully withheld or unreasonable delay under 18 U.S.C. Sec. 218. Also See 5 U.S.C. Sec. 706(1).

The Director shall be have authority and jurisdiction to adjudication without hearing on error judgment entry under 5 U.S.C. Sec. 706(2)(B)(C), Sec. 554(a)(3),(5),(e), 28 U.S.C. Sec. 751(b), 28 U.S.C. Rule 79, 28 U.S.C. Sec. 604(a)(2), 5 U.S.C. Sec. 557(b), 5 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 571, 572; 5 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 8314(a), 8315(a)(1) (2), 76 Stat. 1121-1122 (1962), 5 U.S.C. Sec. 8337, 299 F.2d 525 (1962).

The final judgment entry of the complaint is dismissed, shall be mistake to the court interlocutory order the defendants'motion to dismiss complaint are Allowed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1292(a)(3) and shall be reverse pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Rule 60.

The term of Director adjudication within quarterly after such fanal entry judgment error, shall be applicability under 28 U.S.C. Sec. 604(a), 5 U.S.C. Sec. 552(a)(2)(C).

III. The Director indirectly cause of making judgment entry the complaint is dismissed of deputy clerk, to the court interlcutory order the defendants' motion to dismiss complaint are Allowdd, shall be mistake and shall be reverse pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1292(a)(3) 28 U.S.C. Rule 60.

The Director indirectly cause make mistake, shall be implied relief under 5 U.S.C. Sec. 702, 28 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 751(b), 604(a)(2)(b).

IV. The Director indirectly cause that(1) the petitioner disorderly conduct, refuse, and (2) attempted to assault police officer of the federal police officer Craig Hame where they were lack of not comply of adversely affected applicable under any law or statute and where they were lack of adversely affected of injury that can be caare in condiction in a medical facility, shall be false statement of issue in violation of 18 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 231(a)(3), 111.

The Director indirectly cause of making false, fictious or fraudulent statement of issue, shall be indirectly conviction of fined or imprisoned, or both in violation of 18 U.S.C. Sec. 287. Also See. 18 U.S.C. Sec. 494.

(3) Intimidate or interfere the petitioner from inform that the petitioner's petition or motion should be properly to Director for adjudicate on error judgment entry and for purpose of examine whose right signature denied peitioner's petition, shall be conviction of fined or imprisoned, or both in violation of 18 U.S.C. Sec. 245(b)(1)(B), (4)(b),(5).

The Director indirectly cause under color of legal wrong of employees thereof, shall be implied relief under 5 U.S.C. Sec. 702, 28 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 561(f)(g)(h), 565, 751(b), 604(a)(1)(2)(8)(22),(b).

CONCLUSION

The rational measuring above of the petition when the U.S. Court of Appeals did not accepted the case which directly and indirectly against U.S. Director of Courts; the Supreme Court, shall be have jurisdiction to issue an extraordinary writ of mandamus and certiorari for purpose of review.

Date this 19 day of August 1996.

Praseuth Panthong
348 Walker Street, Room =6
Lowell, Massachusetts 01851

Petitioner-Self Counsel of Record
Pro Se.

Case No. 96-1147

APPENDIX

IN U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

In re: Praseuth Panthong

Plantiff

v.

Director of U.S. Courts
For the District of Massachusetts (Boston).

Defendent

APPENDIX I

(i). On April 11 1996. Before Selya Boudin and Stahl Circuit Judges: Plaintiff s petition for review as mandamus is denied and motion for leave to intervene is denied.

(ii). Plaintiff petition for review and not petition for a writ of mandamus, to which plaintiff filed under agreeable usage and principle of law in a case which AND against whom it may concern on below but it was denied.

(iii). Plaintiff brought a petition for review as independent action against agency failed to adjudication within quarterly without hearing on the final judgment entry error (2) on the error judgment entry of the deputy clerk. and (3) on the federal police officer make a false statements of issued against the plaintiff and the federal police and the staff of U.S. Magistrate Judge or deputy clerk intimidate or interfere the petitioner from federally protected function shall not be denied the appropriate original jurisdiction as first instance of a court under 5 U.S.C. Sec. 702 a person suffering the legal wrong by federal employees and agency thereof whether acted or failed to acted is entitle to judicial review. In 5 U.S.C. Sec. 704, for the pupose of this section whether or not there has been presented or determine an application for a declaratory order for any form of reconsideration is reviewable. In 5 U.S.C. Sec. 706, the reviewing court shall have authority to detemine on agency whether any scope is applicable. In Fed. Rule. App. Pro. 15(a) of the First Circuit, the term petition for review will include agency, board, and commission.

(iv). The court of appeals denied plaintiff's motion for leave to intervene for judgment by default for falure of agency answer to a petition within 20 days, shall be failure to entered judgment by default under Fed. R. App. Pro. 15(b) of the First Circuit, the judgment by default shall be entered against whom for failure to answer to the petition within 20 days. In Port Wide Container Comp. Inc. v. Interstate Maintencance Corp. 440 F.2d 1195 (3th Cir. 1971), motion denied 420 F.2d 1364 (10th Cir. 1970), petition for rehearing and/or modification of decision denied 211 F.2d 808. affirmed 635 F.2d 603 (7th Cir. 1980) the court of appeals affirmed the judgment by default against defendant whether or not there is a notice of motion for failure to answer or to appear.

(v). The court of appeals shall be prohibit from entered in the order the title word of mandamus establish in Plum Creek Co. v. Hutton, 608 F.2d 1285 (1979), all writs Act is not to aid government in conducting a more efficient investigation when other forms are available.

(vi). Conclusion: The petitioner petition for review and motion for leave to intervene, shall not be denied; and the court of appeals shall be prohibit from entered in the order title word of "Mandamus";

APPENDIX I I

(i). From November 3 1995 of Deputy Clerk Nancy Lee Irwin entry the judgment dismiss to February 5 or 15 1996 of the petitioner petition for review with the court of appeals: the petitioner was failed to adjudicate within quarterly on the judgment of the complaint is dismissed to be the judgment of the complaint is affirmed for purpose of comply the court interlocutory order the defendants motion to diss complaint are allowed, by the Respondent Director.

(ii). The director failed to acted within quarterly on the error judgment entry, shall be declare void and rescind contract under Title 18 U.S.C. Sec. 218, it make void and rescind contract for unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delay and in addition to other remedies in contract the amount expended. Also Se. 5 U.S.C. Sec. 706(1).

(iii). Whether or not the petitioner motion for any forms of reconsideration the director shall have duty to adjudication on the error judgment entry in 5 U.S.C. Sec. 706(2)(B)(C), the reviewing court shall conclusion on agency found to be contrary to be constitutional right power in excess of statutory jurisdiction authority, and limitations. In 5 U.S.C. Sec. 554(a)(3)(5)(e), it make agency adjudication on the record without hearing when there is involved the proceeding in which decision rest solely on inspection tests or election: in the cases in which agency is acting as an agent for a court; and with like effect as in the case of other order, and in its sound discretion, may issue a declaratory order to terminate a controversy or remove uncertainty. In 28 Sec. 751(b), the deputy clerk may be approved by the Director of the Office of Administrative of U.S. Courts.

The agency shall inquire for the file of the docket entry for purpose of adjudication in 28 U.S.C. Rule 79, the record of the civil case have the appealable order or order affecting title to or lien upon real or personal property by the court and the judgment statement final entry by any clerk. In 28 U.S.C. Sec. 604(a)(2), the Director shall have duty to examine the state of the docket of the courts. In 5 U.S.C. Sec. 557(b), the agency shall decision on the record from the file of the clerk without parties motion when either in specific cases or by general rule. This petitioner is student purpose of complete the U.S. Politics Program shall have the privacy right to seeking the end what suppose

to have under the law in 5 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 571, 572, for the purpose of administrative program is require to determine for the protection of the end of private right and privileges through rule making and adjudications.

The petitioner did not mean is have duty to remove agency from duty for any reason but just for instruction of application requirement in 5 U.S.C. Sec. sec. 8314(a), 8315(a)(1) (2), it require agency to produce a paper record, or other document in properly or appropriate right, before the agency is not be retirement from his duty. In 76 Stat 1121-1122 (1962), the agency is removing by the president for misfeasance, inefficiency, or the neglect of duty. Also Se. 28 U.S.C. Sec. 611. In 5 U.S.C. Sec. 8337, an employee who complete 5 years of member service is found by the Office of Personnel Management to become disable shall be retired on his own application.

(iv). The final judgment entry by the deputy clerk Nancy Lee Irwin, for the petitioner, the complaint is dismissed shall be mistake and shall be reverse to be the judgment of the complaint is affirmed for purpose of comply the court interlocutory order the defendants motion to dismiss complaint are "allowed" of if defendants need to appeal under 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1292(a)(3), the court of appeals shall have jurisdiction of appeals from the district court interlocutory decrees determining the rights and liabilities of the parties to the admiralty case in which appeal from whose final decrees are allowed. In 28 U.S.C. Rule 60, it make reverse the judgment entry for mistake away from the court order.

(v). The Respondent Director, shall adjudication "within quarterly" after such entry the final judgment mistake by any clerk, shall be applicable term of agency action establish in 28 U.S.C. Sec. 604(a), the Director shall act within Semiannually report. In 5 U.S.C. Sec. 552(a)(2)(C), each agency shall act within quarterly to publish the opinion for records.

(vi). Conclusion: The Respondent Director inefficiency and neglect of duty of adjudication on the error judgment entry of the deputy clerk the complaint is dismissed to be the judgment entry of the complaint is affirmed for comply the court final interlocutory order the defendants motion to dismiss complaint are allowed, shall be declare

void and rescind contract for unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delay.

(vii). The petitioner claim directly against respondent director in the sum of $50 000 for the reason of the petitioner claim against other respondents in contract in low court of U.S. Magistrate Judge Collings in the sum of $50 000 in case.

APPENDIX III

(A)(i). On November 3, 1995, the petitioner was :.indirectly cause making the final judgment entry of the complaint is dismissed of the U.S. District Court Deputy Clerk adversely to the court interlocutory order the defendants' motion to dismiss complaint are allowed, by the respondent director.

(ii). The petitioner indirectly cause against director that the judgment entry the complaint is dismissed of the deputy clerk, shale be mistake when the court interlocutory order the defendants motion to dismiss complaint are allowed of if defendants need to appeal under 5 U.S.C. Sec. 1292(a)(3), the court of appeals shall have jurisdiction of appeal from district court decrees determining the rights and liabilities of the parties to the admiralty cases in which appeal by whom final decrees are allowed. In 28 U.S.C. Rule 60, it make reverse the judgment entry for mistake away from the court order.

(iii). The petitioner cause that, the agency shall be implied relief when the petitioner claim under 5 U.S.C. Sec. 702 it confer authority to grant implied forbids the relief which is sought and grant the consent to suite expressly. In 28 Sec. 751(b) the deputy clerk may be approved by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. In 28 U.S.C. Sec. 604(a)(2),(b), the Director shall have duties to supervise any matters relating to office of the clerks.

There shall be proper procedure, the petitioner independently action against the cause of entry error judgment in subprovisions of 28 U.S. C. Rule 60(b), the procedure for obtaining any relief from a judgment shall be by an independent action.

(iv). Conclusion: The agency indirectly cause making the judgment

entry the complaint is dismissed of deputy clerk. shall be mistake when the court interlocutory order the defendants motion to dismiss complaint are allowed; and agency shall be implied relief.

(v). Petitioner claim of implied against respondet director in the sum of $10,000.

(B). Since in U.S. District Court Case No. 95-11452-MLW (Collings . U.S.M.J.). Plaintiff Praseuth Panthong v. Defendant Charlotte Dibenedetto, et al.

(i). The ORDERED of U.S. District Court Magistrate Judge Collings : The defendant Dibenedetto's motion to dismiss complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted pursuant to Federal Rule Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) is ALLOWED. Defendants Altarejos and Cummings's motion to dismiss complaint for insufficiency service of process pursuant to Federal Rule Civil Procedure 12(b)(5) is ALLOWED.

But the JUDGMENT entry by the U.S. District Court Deputy Clerk Nancy Lee Irwin: The complaint is dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) and 12(b)(5).

(ii). Since in the first cause of application against defendant Dibenedetto for improper use of mailing address of plaintiff for sending the notice of entry the final judgment dismiss for purpose of petitioner appeal. The petitioner cited the statute and its provision for state a claim upon which relief can be granted under 11 U. S. C. Rule 2002(g), it make rule that all notice shall be mails to the address in the document which filed later or different address of plaintiff shall be used.

Defendant as deputy clerk did not properly follow the instruction of the judge but use immunity for prevent from liabilities shall be insufficiency in Sindram v. Suda, 986 F.2d at 1461 (1993), although some court have held that clerks are not entitle to absolute immunity for performance of nondiscretionary ministerial function.

(iii). Since in the Second and Third cause of application against defendants Altarejos and Cummings. The plaintiff paid the fee for filing complaint and served a Copay of Summons and Complaint upon

defendants by plaintiff himself shall be sufficiency service of process prior to the motion to strike cited the Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 4(c)(1),(e)(1)(2), and (h), the subprovision providing that, the plaintiff who paid fee for filing complaint is responsible for service of process by himself. Establish in DeShaney v. Winnebago County Dept of Social Service 109 S.Ct. 998 (1989) the due process clause generally confer no affirmative right to government aid event where such aid may be necessary to secure life liberty or property interest of which the government itself may not deprive the individual.

APPENDIX IV

(i). On November 17 1995, the petitioner was indirectly cause issued of the federal police officer Craig Hamel make false statement of the claim of (1) the petitioner disorderly conduct refuse Land (2) attempted to assault him and police officer Kalliher; and (3) summoned called and removed from the area of U.S. Magistrate Judge Collings Chambers of the staff of U.S. Magistrate Judge Collings and federal police officer, while the petitioner inform that the petition should be properly to director for adjudication on mistake judgment entry and whose right signature denied the petition or motion by respondent director.

(ii). The petitioner indirectly cause that, the statement of issued that the petitioner disorderly conduct refuse and attempted to assault where they were lack of not comply of adverse affected applicable under any law or statute and where they were lack of injury that can be care in condition in medical facility shall be false statement of the claim in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. Sec. 231(a)(3), before it can be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than five year or both it shall be whoever commits or attempts to commit any act to obstruct impede or interfere with any law enforcement officer lawfully engaged in the lawful performance of his official duties incident to and during the commission of a civil disorder. In Title 18 U.S.C. Sec. 111, before it can be fined not more than $5 000 or imprisoned not more than three years or both it shall be whoever forcibly assault any person designate in section 1114 of this title while engage in or on account of the performance of his official duties.

(iii). The agency indirectly cause make false, fictious or frauldulent statement of the claim of police officer Craig Hamel, to upon the petitioner, shall be indirectly conviction of fined or imprisoned, or both in violation of 18 U.S.C. Sec. 287, it make whoever make a claim presented to upon any person in false, fictious or frauldulent, shall be conviction of fined nor more than$ 10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(iv). The Director of the staff of U.S. Magistrate Judge Collings or deputy clerk and federal police officer indirectly intimidate and interfere the petitioner from asking that the petitioner's petition or motion should be properly to director for determine on error judgment entry and for purpose of examine whose right signature denied peition or motion, shall be indirectly conviction of fined or imprisoned, or both in violation of 18 U.S.C. Sec. 245(b)(1)(B),(4)(b),(5), it make whoever whether or not acting unde color of law to intimidate or interfere with any person because he is or has been order to intimidate or interfere with any person from: enjoying any benefit, right, service, privilege, and facility, or activity provide by or administer by the United States; protection to so participate; or participate lawfully in speech or peaeful assembly opposing any denial of the opportunity to so participate, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(v). The petitioner cause that, the Director, shall be implied relief when the petitioner claim under 5 U.S.C. Sec. 702, it confer authority to grant implied forbids the relief which is sought and grant the consent to suite expressly. In 28 U.S.C. Sec. 561(f)(g)(h), 565, 751(b) 604(a)(1)(2)(8)(22),(b), the respondent agency, shall have duties to appoint, designate, approved, and supervise the federal police officers and deputy clerk.

WHEREFORE petitioner damands for judgment against United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit in the sum of $50,000; and directly and indirectly against Direvtor of U.S. Courts in the sum of $71,000, together with petitioner's costs and disbursement incurred herein.

Date this 19 day of August 1996.

Praseuth Panthong
348 Walker Street, Room #6
Lowell, Massachusetts 01851

Petitioner-Self Counsel of Record
Pro Se.

JURISDICTION

Cases	Contents
28 U.S.C. Sec. 1251(b)(1), Sec. 1254(1), Article III of U. S. Constitution, and Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment. See page 1.	The Supreme Court shall be have authority and jurisdiction to review the case in the court of appeals, either by writ of mandamus and certiorari-when the court of appeals did not decide the case which directly and indirectly against agency.

A DIRECTED OF ALLOWANCE FOR A WRITS

U.S.S.C. Rule 20, 28 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 342, 376, 1651, and 2241(a); 626 F.2d 1052 (1980) ITT Comm Devolepment Corp. v. Barton, 569 F.2d 1351_1352 (1978), and Plum Creek Lumber Co. v. Hutton, 608 F.2d 1285 (1979). See petition page 23.	The statute, rule and law making it for the petitioner to directed of allowance the supreme court to issue an extraordinary writ of mandamus and certiorari, and/or an alternative writ shall be issue for review, when the court of appeals failed to established principles of law to decide the case against agency in directly or indirectly .

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I. 5 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 702, 704 and 706; Fed. R. App. Pro 15(a)	The statute making it for the pet itioner be entitle to judicial review

(d); Port Wid Continer Comp, Inc. v. Interstate Maintenance Corp. 440 F.2d 1195 (3th Cir. 1971). Petition page 3.

when the case against whether agency or employees thereof acted or failed to acte is reviewable; and it make for the petitioner be entitle to the judgment default by a motion for failure of agency answer or appear within 20 days.

Plum Creek Lumber Co. v. Hutton, 608 F.2d 1285 (1979) Petition page 3.

It prohibit all writs act from aiding government in conducting a more efficient investigation on employees acted under color of legal wrong when other forms are available.

II. 18 U.S.C. Sec. 218. Also See. 5 U.S.C. Sec. 706(1).

It declare void and rescind contract for unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delay.

5 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 706(2)(B)(C), 554(a)(3),(5),(e). 28 U.S.C. Sec. 751(b). 28 U.S.C. Rule 79.; 28 u.S.C. Sec. 604(a)(2).; 5 U.S.C. Sec. 557(b). 5 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 571, 572.; 5 u.S.C. sec. Sec. 8314(a), 8315()a)(1)(2). 76 Stat. 1121-1122 (1962), 5 U.S.C. Sec. 8337. 299 F.2d 525 (1962).; 28 U.S.C. Sec. 604(a)(2). 5 U.S.C. Sec. 552(a)(2)(C); 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1292(a)(3). 28 U.S.C. Rule 60 petition page 3.

The Director of U.S.Courts shall be have authority and jurisdiction to "adjudicate" within quarterly without hearing on the error judgment entry of the complaint is dismissed to be the judgment entry of the complaint is affirmed for comply the court interlocutory order the defendants' motion to dismiss complaint are Allowed.

III. 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1292(a)(3), Rule 60. petition page 4.

The judgment entry of the complaint is dismissed, shall be mistake when the court of appeal

shall have jurisdiction of appeal from the district court interlocutory decree in which apeal of whose final decree are Allowed limited to liability; and mistake judgment to the court order, shall be reverse.

5 U.S.C. Sec. 702. 28 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 751(b), 604(2),(b). Petition page 4.

The statute making it for the petitioner claim of implied relief to the court grant it when there is reasonable ground in supporting the suite.

IV. 18 U.S.C. Sec. 231(a)(3). Petition page 4.

The claim of disorderly conduct and refuse, shall be false claim when there is lack of adversely affected of obstruct, imped or interfere with law enforcement officer while engage on duties.

18 U.S.C. Sec. 111. Petition page 4.

The claim of attempted to assault, shall be false claim, when there is lack of forcibly assault another person designate in section 1114 of this title, that can be care in condition in medical facitlity or be compensatability.

18 U.S.C. Sec. 287. Petition page 4.

Whoever making false, fictious or fraudulent statement of the claim presented to upon any opponent person, shall be conviction of fined or imprisoned, or both.

18 U.S.C. Sec. 245(b)(1)(B), (4)(b),(5). Petition page 4.

Whoever whether or not acting under color of law, to intimidate

or interfere with any person, shall be fined or imprisoned, or both.

5 U.S.C. SEc. 702. 28 U.S.C. Sec. 561(f)(g)(h), 565. Also see. 28 U.S.C. Sec. 604(a)(8),(22),(b).; 28 U.S.C. Sec. Sec. 751(b), 604(a)(1)(2)(b). Petition page 4.

The statute making it for the petitioner claim of implied relief to the court grant it when the Director has duties to appointed federal law enforcement officer and deputy clerk thereof consent in supporting the suite.

Date this 20 day of August 1996.

Praseuth Panthong
348 Walker Street, Room #6
Lowell, Massachusetts 01851

Petitioner-Self Counsel of Record-Pro Se.